UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,906	07/12/2005	Derek Geoffrey Finch	033963-015	6242
21839 7590 06/30/2008 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404			EXAMINER	
			BARKER, MATTHEW M	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3662	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/30/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/541,906	FINCH ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MATTHEW M. BARKER	3662
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 F This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 17-28 and 33-36 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 17-28 and 33-36 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject.	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and all all all all all all all all all al	cepted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the I	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 3662

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 17-19, 21-28, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Molyneux-Berry (EP 0851238 A2).

Regarding claim 17, Molyneux-Berry discloses a method of extracting a radial velocity characteristic of a target from one or more coherent radiation pulse bursts comprising the steps of :

- -receiving radiation echo returns of the pulse bursts from a remote scene (page 5, line 37);
- -processing the echo returns into in-phase (I) and quadrature (Q) components (page 5, lines 39-40);
- -measuring returns at intervals to provide sampled data (page 5, lines 46-49);
- -applying a predetermined function to the I-Q returns and modifying the predetermined function to match the sampled data as a function of velocity (page 4, lines 7-15); -determining the target radial velocity in dependence upon said modification step of the predetermined function (page 11, lines 21-24); and
- -outputting the determined target radial velocity (page 12, lines 11-12).

Regarding claim 18, Molyneux-Berry discloses the claimed optimized curve fitting (page 4, lines 20-25).

Regarding claim 21, Molyneux-Berry discloses extracting target amplitude from the sampled data (page 9, lines 8-13).

Regarding claim 22, Molyneux-Berry discloses extracting range ambiguity (page 2, lines 45-48).

Regarding claim 23, Molyneux-Berry discloses extracting azimuth from the sampled data (page 9, lines 30-31).

Regarding claims 24-26, Molyneux-Berry discloses that the pulse bursts are transmitted at non- constant PRI bursts at a frequency which is changed between successive pulses, and such echo returns are measured at non-equi-spaced intervals (page 4, lines 26-27).

Regarding claim 27, Molyneux-Berry discloses that the pulse bursts are internally coherent (page 2, lines 25-27) and mutually incoherent (page 4, lines 26-27: varied PRI on a burst of pulses basis).

Regarding claim 28, Molyneux-Berry discloses carrying out conventional MTI filtering before step (d) (page 4, lines 38-39).

Regarding claims 19 and 33, Molyneux-Berry discloses the claimed clutter return model (page 4, lines 44-51).

Regarding claims 34 and 35, Molyneux-Berry discloses that the pulse bursts are transmitted at non- constant PRI bursts at a frequency which is changed between successive pulses (page 4, lines 26-27).

Art Unit: 3662

Regarding claim 36, Molyneux-Berry discloses carrying out conventional MTI filtering before step (d) (page 4, lines 38-39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molyneux-Berry as applied to claim 19. .

Molyneux-Berry does not specify that the clutter model is a low order polynomial function. However, it is well known that a cutter signal may be represented as a polynomial function, and it would have been obvious to do so in the invention of Molyneux-Berry with no new or unexpected results.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 2/19/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 17-28 and 33-36 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Molyneux-Berry.

Art Unit: 3662

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Doerry et al. relates to a MTI radar target detection system that measures radial velocity.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW M. BARKER whose telephone number is (571)272-3103. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Tarcza can be reached on (571)272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3662

/Matthew M Barker/ Examiner, Art Unit 3662

/Thomas H. Tarcza/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3662